

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Initially, the Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 12-29 are allowed and claims 3-7 contain allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objects to the drawings as failing to comply with MPEP § 608.02(g) because Figures 13-18 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. In response, Figures 13-18 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Clean copy replacement sheets (4 sheets) of Figures 13-18 having the legend --Prior Art-- are enclosed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2 and 8-11<sup>1</sup> under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,882,455 to Arima (hereinafter “Arima”). Additionally, the Examiner rejects claims 1 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,635,837 to Subramanian et al., (hereinafter “Subramanian”).

In response, allowable claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form including the limitations of its base claim 1. Consequently, claim 1 has been canceled. Claim 2 has been amended to change its dependency from canceled claim 1 to independent claim 3. Claims 8-11 have also been canceled.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cancellation of claims 1 and 8-11 and the amendment of claim 2 to depend from allowable claim 3 renders the rejections under 35

---


<sup>1</sup> Although the rejection lists claims 1, 2 and 8-10 as being rejected, the body of the rejection (at page 3, line 2) also discusses the rejection of claim 11. Thus, the Applicant has considered claim 11 to be rejected, consistent with the “Office Action Summary” attached to the Official Action.

U.S.C. § 102(e) and (a) moot. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and (a).

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 3, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the cited references and is allowable and that claims 4-7 being dependent upon claim 3 are at least allowable therewith.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas Spinelli  
Registration No.: 39,533

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

TS:cm/dg  
Encl. (Clean Copy Replacement Sheets for Figures 13-18)